

Claims 1-13, 24-37, and 39 were rejected as being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Nguyen, Normile, and Laney, for the reasons detailed at pages 4-12 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse all art rejections.

Independent Claims 1 and 36 recites structure and steps for decoding interframe image data, intraframe-encoding and storing the image data, decoding and editing the stored image data, and then interframe encoding the edited image data. Sugiyama acknowledges at column 3, lines 26-42 that interframe-encoded image data cannot be easily imaged-edited. However, Sugiyama fails to discloses structure or function for editing image data as claimed in Claims 1 and 36 of the subject application. Nguyen discloses that characters are synthesized with compressed data. However, none of the art of record discloses or suggests structure or function for performing encoding using the same encoding method as the inputted encoded data after editing in a differently-encoded format. In the present invention, it is possible to reproduce both the edited images and the unedited images using the same decoder. In contrast, coding and decoding according to the cited art would require a dedicated decoder for each of the edited image and the unedited image. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 36 (and their dependent claims) are fully patentable over the cited art.

Independent Claims 5, 24, 37, and 39 all recite structure and steps whereby moving image data which is to be


edited is decoded, without decoding all the frames comprising the moving image data. In contrast, none of the art of record in the case, including Sugiyama and Nguyen, discloses that a reduction of the storage data amount can be achieved by decoding only the frame to be edited using the detected intraframe without decoding all the frames comprising the moving image data. Accordingly, Claims 5, 24, 37, and 39 (and their dependent claims) are fully patentable over the cited art.

Independent Claim 29 recites decoding means for decoding intraframe-encoded data, instructing means for providing an editing instruction to edit the intraframe encoded data, and encoding means for interframe-encoding the frame images of a minimum number which are necessary to decode the moving image data according to the instruction provided by the instruction means. Thus, as compared with the data which is not encoded in the intraframe method, data reduction can be realized. Again, none of the art in the case discloses or suggests that data reduction which can be realized through the features of Claim 29 discussed above. Therefore, Claim 29 (and its dependent claims) is fully patentable over the cited art.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 347-8100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 31,588

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
277 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10172
Facsimile: --(212) 758-2982

F501\W138132\dew